

CORRECTION

Alfonso F, Pérez-Vizcayno MJ, Cárdenas A, García del Blanco B, García-Touchard A, López-Minguéz JR, Benedicto A, Masotti M, Zueco J, Iñiguez A, Velázquez M, Moreno R, Mainar V, Domínguez A, Pomar F, Melgares R, Rivero F, Jiménez-Quevedo P, Gonzalo N, Fernández C, Macaya C, for the RIBS IV Study Investigators (under the auspices of the Interventional Cardiology Working Group of the Spanish Society of Cardiology)

A Prospective Randomized Trial of Drug-Eluting Balloons Versus Everolimus-Eluting Stents in Patients With In-Stent Restenosis of Drug-Eluting Stents: The RIBS IV Randomized Clinical Trial

J Am Coll Cardiol 2015;66:23-33

In the Results section of the Abstract:

...(absolute mean difference: 0.23 mm; 95% CI: 0.07 to 0.38),...

should have read:

...(absolute mean difference: 0.23 mm; 95% CI: 0.07 to 0.38),...

The complete correct sentence is as follows:

At late angiography (median 247 days; 90% of eligible patients), patients in the EES arm had a significantly larger minimal lumen diameter (2.03 ± 0.7 mm vs. 1.80 ± 0.6 mm; $p < 0.01$) (absolute mean difference: 0.23 mm; 95% CI: 0.07 to 0.38), net lumen gain (1.28 ± 0.7 mm vs. 1.01 ± 0.7 mm; $p < 0.01$), and lower percent diameter stenosis ($23 \pm 22\%$ vs. $30 \pm 22\%$; $p < 0.01$) and binary restenosis rate (11% vs. 19%; $p = 0.06$), compared with patients in the DEB arm.

The Fundación Interhospitalaria de Investigación Cardiovascular was the sponsor of this study.

This new information has been included in the Methods section of the paper.

The online version has been corrected.

The authors apologize for this error.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2015.07.044>

